

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of Atty. Docket
DAVID W. CUCCIA PHA 23,280A
Serial No.: 09/882,080 Group Art Unit: 2614
Filed: June 15, 2001 Examiner: L. Lo

GP/261
#6
MG
COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED
9/18/02

Title: INSTANT REPLAY OF DIGITAL VIDEO OPTIMIZED USING NON
MPEG FRAME TAGS

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED
SEP 12 2002
Technology Center 2600

9/16/02

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 3,
2002, please consider the following:

R E M A R K S

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being
unpatentable over Sporer et al. in view of Andrew et al.

In response to the above rejection, it is respectfully
submitted that claim 1 recites features neither taught nor
suggested by Sporer et al. in view of Andrew et al. In
particular, such features include "a tag inserter, for
inserting marker tags into each picture of the compressed
video stream which reference locations in memory where
each picture of the video is stored".

In addressing this feature in the above rejection, the field index of Sporer et al. is being relied on. However, in column 9, lines 16-53, Sporer et al. discloses:

"For each MPEG file, either the import process or the digitize process creates and index 70 with one entry 72 for each image, such as a field. Note that the entries 72 are stored in the order in which the compressed images occur in the bitstream..

Each entry is 64 bits long and includes an offset 74, which may be represented by 48 bits, e.g. bits 0:47..

Each entry also includes an indication of the picture type 76, which may be represented by two bits,...

A random access bit 78 is also stored. This may be a single bit that indicates whether random access into the bitstream at the offset...is possible..

The last value in entry 72 is a temporal offset82..."


(A)
Bjw
Based on the above disclosure, it is evident that the index of Sporer et al. is not "inserting marker tags into each picture of the compressed video stream", as required by the claim. It is further evident that the index of Sporer et al. does not "reference locations in memory where each picture of the video is stored", as further required by the claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this feature is distinguishable over Sporer et al. in view of Andrew et al.

In view of the above-described distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that the invention of claim 1 is not obvious over Sporer et al. in view of Andrew et al. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the above

rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn so that the present application may proceed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Russell Gross, Reg. 40,007
Attorney
(914) 333-9631

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

On September 4, 2002
By Edna Chapa